DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 130 SO 027 407

AUTHOR Bossard, Keith; Chase, Sue; Dove, Tim; Hoover, Shirley; Merryfield, Merry M.; Norris, Jim; Rayburn, Bob; Shapiro, Steve; Wainer, Barbara

TITLE Can Our Learning Community Survive? Teachers Examine the Long-Term Effectiveness of Their PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education.

PUB DATE 1996-00-00

NOTE 24p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; *Global Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development; *Professional Development Schools; *Social Studies; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This study addresses the question of whether university professors and experienced teachers can work collaboratively over time to improve teacher education and classroom practice in social studies and global education. Eight classroom teachers identify factors associated with an effective professional development school network and examine issues and concerns that may threaten its survival. Major factors include the diversity of teachers and schools, new roles and opportunities, problems with challenging the status quo, scrutiny and reflection of practice, time commitments, and difficulties dealing with university cultures. (EH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 415 130

# Can Our Learning Community Survive?
## Teachers Examine the Long-Term Effectiveness of their PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education

Keith Bossard

Columbus Alternative High School, Columbus, OH

Sue Chase

Hilliard High School, Hilliard, OH

Tim Dove

McCord Middle School, Worthington, OH

Shirley Hoover

Upper Arlington High School, Upper Arlington, OH

Merry M. Merryfield

The Ohio State University

Jim Norris

Linden McKinley High School, Columbus, OH

Bob Rayburn

Eastland Career Center, Eastland Vocational School District, Columbus, OH

Steve Shapiro

Reynoldsburg High School, Reynoldsburg, OH

Barbara Wainer

Independence High School, Columbus, OH

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MERRY M MERRYFIELD

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO 027 407

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Can university professors and experienced teachers work collaboratively over many years to improve teacher education and classroom practice in social studies and global education? In this study, eight classroom teachers identify factors associated with the effectiveness of a professional development school network and examine issues and concerns that may threaten its survival. Major factors include the diversity of teachers and schools, new roles and opportunities, challenging the status quo, opening practice to scrutiny and reflection, time commitments, and dealing with university cultures.

# Can Our Learning Community Survive? Teachers Examine the Long-Term Effectiveness of their PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education

Although educators in schools and universities have long histories of working together, such collaboration has become more extensive as school districts and universities have formalized partnerships as part of restructuring K-12 schools and reforming teacher education. These new structures and relationships have been inspired by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986), the vision of the Holmes Group (1986, 1990) and the professional experiences of educators who have long seen the potential of schools and universities working more closely together. Central to many of these efforts are professional development schools (PDSs, also called clinical schools, teaching academies, and professional practice schools) where K-12 educators and university professors work together to improve both teacher education and classroom practice (Book, 1996; Brainard, 1989; Levine, 1992; Meade, 1991; Zeichner; 1992; Zimpher, 1990).

From these efforts a new research literature is emerging that examines processes and outcomes of collaborative structures and perspectives of K-12 and university educators involved in such career-long teacher education partnerships. There is literature now on the initial stages of PDS collaboration and "lessons learned" about developing school/university partnerships and programs. Unlike most topics in K-12 school reform or teacher education, there has been a concerted effort by K-12 educators and university faculty to collaborate in research and co-author scholarly papers about PDSs and the changes brought about by their learning and teaching together.

However, in the scholarship about professional development schools there have been few studies that focus on teachers' perspectives on PDSs once long-term collaborative partnerships are developed and institutionalized. The study described in this paper is centered on understanding teachers' assessment of factors contributing to the long-term survival and effectiveness

of a PDS network in social studies and global education. The study is positioned within the perspectives of eight classroom teachers who have served as a PDS leadership team since its conception. First, we provide the objectives of the study and a review of relevant research, and then we discuss methods, a brief background of our PDS, our findings, and implications for the field.

## Objectives

The objectives of the study include (1) examining factors that teachers associate with the effectiveness of the PDS, (2) identifying teachers' concerns and issues about their PDS work, and (3) understanding the implications of these factors, concerns, and issues for the long-term survival and success of the PDS. The overarching goal of the paper is understanding teachers' perspectives on their long-term work with each other and university educators in collaborative school/university programs.

## Review of the Literature

Professional development schools aim to improve both teacher education and K-12 schools through collaborative structures that alter the traditional ways that teachers, administrators, and university faculty work together by situating all parties as equal partners who share power and responsibility and act from mutual respect for each other's expertise and knowledge (Meade, 1991; Zeichner, 1992). How do teachers view PDS collaboration with university faculty? How do they see their roles change as they build collaborative relationships and work more closely with their colleagues, preservice teachers, and university faculty? What do teachers gain from such relationships, and what are their concerns and issues?

Teachers' feelings of efficacy and empowerment in a PDS are related to the degree in which they are directly involved in decision-making. In their study of school/university collaboration, Rushcamp and Roehler (1992) found participatory decision-making related significantly to the teachers' ability to resolve conflicts and build a strong community of learners. Teachers involved in PDSs in Kentucky had very positive attitudes towards their

collaborative work when they were making decisions, working in teams, and the school learning climate was positive (Ruscoe, Whitford, Egginton, & Esselman, 1989). Over three years, however, they did feel slightly less efficacious as they found restructuring difficult and time-consuming (Ruscoe & Whitford, 1991). Others studies have found that teachers' enthusiasm and interest in PDS collaboration may decrease with time and the difficulty of reform (Wilson with Miller and Yerkes, 1993).

When teachers do not share in decision-making or feel ownership in the PDS, they often find ways to resist involvement. In a study by Stoddard (1993), teachers perceived that the PDS reform was coming to them as a top-down decision, and they found ways to ignore the ideas of university faculty because they did not see the reforms as relevant to their teaching. Book (1996) concludes that the best way for university faculty to engage teachers in PDS initiatives is to collaborate with them rather then telling or directing them what to do.

Differences in school and university cultures may lead to problems as teachers and university faculty often have different goals, values, rewards, and ways of working (Brookhart & Loadman, 1992; Leming, 1989). The clash of school and university cultures is one of the most common themes in PDS research (Berry & Catoe, 1994; Book, 1996; Snyder, 1994; Stoddard, 1993). Perhaps the real issue is one building a new culture of collaboration (see several illustrations in Johnston & Kirschner, 1996). Yet such new cultures may not be rewarded by either schools or universities.

Positive changes teachers perceive that are related to the effectiveness of PDS reforms include increasing reflective practice (Berry & Catoe, 1994; Neufeld & Freeman, 1993), greater collegiality and communication among colleagues (Grossman, 1994; Wiseman & Nason, 1993; Woloszyk, 1992), and the ability of teachers to move beyond their own boundaries to collaborate, understand contexts of others, and create a new culture (Gehrke, Young, & Sagmiller, 1991).

Although PDS research is relatively new and untested by longitudinal

studies, these tentative findings do point to some positive outcomes of PDS relationships as well as some potential problems. Shared decision-making, reflective practice, increased collegiality and communication, and the ability of teachers to see education across different contexts are perceived by teachers to be benefits of PDS collaboration. Major concerns about PDS include school/university culture clashes and problems with time.

## Methods

Since the initiation of our collaboration in the summer of 1990, we have kept records documenting our shared decision-making as a leadership team of eight classroom teachers and one university professor. In 1992 we began systematic collection of data four times a year to identify areas of strength and weakness and develop indicators of effectiveness. We have used questionnaires, individual and group interviews, and focus groups held in conjunction with our team-taught methods courses, student teaching seminars, and PDS leadership team meetings. Data have been collected from all people immediately involved in the PDS Network, including practicing teachers, school administrators, the preservice teachers (approximately 24 a year), university supervisors, and university faculty. Additional data came from our "archives," materials we have collected such as evaluations from inservice workshops, personal journals, cases, memos that sum up meetings, essays written by the preservice teachers, portfolios and assessments, observation forms, professional presentations, and papers we have written. These data, collected and analyzed by the qualitative methods of Lincoln and Guba (1985) serve as the data base for our study. Through the data analysis, our initial categories of factors emerged in two areas, (1) those related to the effectiveness of our PDS and (2) those factors that threaten its long-term survival. In addition to our regularly scheduled data collection, Sue Chase conducted another round of interviews and group discussions to ensure that current perspectives were identified. Many of the illustrations in this paper come directly from those interviews.

## A Brief Background of our PDS Network

One of the most persistent themes in the literature of school/university relationships is the perceived conflict or ideological chasm (Leming, 1992) between what university professors view as preferred theory and practice of K-12 instruction and the instruction valued by practicing teachers. Differences in school and university cultures, beliefs, and practice have been explored, documented and discussed over the years as one of the perennial dilemmas in improving schools and teacher education (Brookhart & Loadman, 1990; Kagan, 1993; Lanier & Little, 1986; Zeichner, Tabachnick & Densmore, 1987). Outcomes of school/university clashes in beliefs often lead to mistrust, hostility, and distancing of relationships when college professors teach ideas that are different from or even in conflict with the practice of teachers in area schools (Leming, 1989; Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1981). Such tensions existed between Ohio State's program in secondary social studies and many teachers in Central Ohio in the 1980s. Our PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education was developed to overcome these school/university conflicts and improve social studies teaching and learning in both school and university programs through long-term school/university collaboration.

Our work with the university grew from teacher/professor relationships during the late 1980s when problems with student teachers and one university supervisor (who was fired in March 1989 because of his sexual harassment of some student teachers) led to an on-going conversations between Merry Merryfield, an Ohio State professor in social studies, and Keith Bossard, social studies department chair at Columbus Alternative High School, about problems in the OSU program and possibilities for improvement. Other interactions over student teachers brought Tim Dove (McCord Middle School) into the discussion. Through school-based research projects on teacher decision-making in global education Jim Norris and Connie White (Linden McKinley High School), Shirley Hoover (Upper Arlington High School), and Steve Shapiro (Reynoldsburg High School) shared perspectives with Merry on improving teaching and learning one day a week over an entire school year. Third, Bob

Rayburn (Eastland Career Center), Barbara Wainer (Independence High School), and Merry got to know each other through coursework in OSU's graduate program in global education, school district inservices, and our local social studies council. Sue Chase and Merry became friends through a mutual colleague, Jeff Cornett, who had worked with Sue extensively during his doctoral program at Ohio State. We came to know each other through intersections with Merry and OSU and found we had much in common. At that time many of us held leadership roles as department chairs in our buildings, curriculum developers for our districts, and through elected offices in the Ohio Council for the Social Studies and our local social studies council. Some of us had been active in global education since the early Columbus and the World (Alger, 1975) curriculum projects of the Mershon Center in the 1970s.

Our informal discussions often led to the need for school and university reforms if we were to improve the preservice social studies certification program and bring about more effective teaching of social studies and global education in area schools. In an early brainstorming session we agreed on the problems that needed to be addressed: (1) the gulf between courses on campus and the realities of the schools, (2) the need for reflective teacher education that prepares teachers for cross-cultural teaching and learning with multicultural and global content, and (3) the lack of time and support to change our institutional structures, reward systems, and roles. We recognized that intensive, long-term school/university collaboration was absolutely essential.

We began to meet more formally to plan how to improve preservice teacher education, and by the spring of 1992 we were in the midst of significant restructuring of Ohio State's undergraduate and graduate social studies certification programs, including a total revision of methods courses and reconceptualization of field experiences. We teachers became "field professors," a title denoting our new roles in designing preservice teacher education and professional development programs and courses, teaching methods courses, mentoring beginning teachers and studying the effects of

collaboration. Our major accomplishments over the last six years include a restructured teacher education program, the development and annual team-teaching of a 10 credit hour field-based methods block, full-day inservice workshops for our social studies colleagues in PDS Network schools, frequent presentations at professional conferences, and several publications. We describe these accomplishments below in the contexts of our findings.

## Findings

Looking back on our six years of school/university collaboration, it was probably in our fourth year that we reached a point where our collaborative structures began to be taken for granted, no longer seen by our schools and colleagues as experimental or tentative. PDS has became the norm of our school/university relationships and our collaboration is viewed as a regular part of our work and that of our social studies departments, as well as a central component in Ohio State's teacher education in social studies and global education. Although the first few years were exciting as we created a new collaborative culture and made critical friendships with social studies colleagues across six school districts, it is professionally rewarding to be beyond the initial stage of developing a school/university partnership. Now we can look ahead with some confidence because we know we are improving teaching and learning in the social studies through our PDS Network. There are a number of factors we associate with the effectiveness of our PDS and, within them, concerns and issues that may endanger its long-term survival.

### Factor 1: Using Our Diversity of Teachers and Schools as a Strength

Long-term professional growth and the development of relationships among teachers across schools and districts are important benefits of our PDS collaboration. Because almost all of our schools have undergone or are currently undergoing systemic or discipline-based school reforms and restructuring, our work together has allowed us to learn first-hand about many different approaches to improving schools and social studies education. Two of our schools are members of the Coalition of Essential Schools, and one school has all classes double-blocked (each period is two hours long, and

teachers have no more that 60 students a trimester). Four of our nine schools have social studies teachers teaming with teachers in language arts, science, math or art (such courses are called "Humanities," "American Studies," and "World Connections"). Our Network schools have different emphases and strengths. Linden McKinley High School is an English as a Second Language magnet school for Columbus Public Schools and brings significant linguistic diversity to our Network. Eastland Career Center is the educational technology center for our county and provides hands-on experiences with new computer and multi-media technologies as well as a school population who have selected vocational education. Columbus Alternative High School (CAHS) is an academic, urban alternative school where all tenth, eleventh and twelfth graders work one day a week off campus in service learning projects. All of our schools are in the process of developing new or revised social studies courses because of the new Ohio Model Curriculum in Social Studies and state-wide proficiency testing in citizenship education at the ninth and twelfth grades. One finding that comes from data collected each year is that all of us and our departments and schools have benefited tangibly from our sharing of ideas, materials, and experiences and our construction of courses, seminars, and assessments. A PDS network that brings together teachers from eight schools in six school districts to work on developing collaborative programs provides access to information and opportunities for learning that few of us have ever experienced. The diversity of our schools, our social studies departments, our students, and our social studies courses has helped us better understand both the importance of context in teaching and the commonalities shared by teachers in different situations.

Our diversity has also been a challenge as we must understand each other's situations in order to plan programs for our preservice teachers and our colleagues. The social studies departments of our eight schools operate quite differently. We have learned to appreciate each other's contexts and provide some flexibility in our methods course and student teaching in order to provide similar assignments and assessments for our preservice teachers.

For example, one of our assignments in our PDS methods courses calls for the creation and teaching of a unit plan. In traditional school structures a unit plan usually means a one to four week plan of 45-55 minute lessons each day. But some of us are in settings where we teach each class two hours everyday and complete a year's course in one semester. Others of us are part of interdisciplinary teams with flexible scheduling decided by the entire team, not a single teacher. Others are in schools with long (six-eight week) units that culminate in exhibitions or other authentic assessments. Some of us teach in schools where new multi-media and electronic mail technologies are a central part of social studies, and others are in schools with very little access to any new educational technology. These diverse settings require flexibility in assignments and a recognition that variances across school buildings do make a difference in curriculum planning and instruction.

When we look back on our early work in setting up PDS requirements for our preservice teachers, we have been struck by our differences in expectations in terms of what they should do on a daily basis, and we recognize the ease with which we were able to compromise and work out rubrics and common assignments across the Network schools. Our focus on shared goals and a shared vision for our PDS has helped us overcome our differences. We recognize that our diversity--different backgrounds, expertise, school cultures and experiences with educational reforms--is our PDS Network's greatest asset in that we constantly learn from each other. However, our diversity does add to the complexity of our work, and it increases the time it takes for us to understand each other's situations and make decisions.

Factor 2: Growing Professionally from the Stimulation of New Roles and Opportunities

PDS collaboration provides numerous opportunities for new roles and professional growth for experienced teachers. We have created and team taught methods courses that have grown from 4 to 10 credit hours. We have become college professors. We do most of the supervision, mentoring, and the making of connections between educational theory and classroom practice in methods

courses and in the schools, tasks that once were left to university professors and supervisors. Now we as field professors are the university teachers in our schools.

Our professional development includes presenting and writing about our PDS work and its effects on our preservice teachers and our own schools. In the last three years, we have made over 10 professional presentations at national meetings of such organizations as the National Council for the Social Studies, the American Educational Research Association, the American Forum for Global Education, and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. We did not know of some of these organizations before PDS, and we have found new knowledge and networks as we have become involved through their meetings. In 1995 we had a grant to write about what we have learned in our work together, and several of us have published articles or chapters on teacher education in social studies and global education (Dove, Norris & Shinew, in press; Levak, Merryfield & Wilson, 1993; Merryfield & White, in press; Shapiro & Merryfield, 1995). Three of us have taken on research and writing to link our Master's work with PDS initiatives, and one of us has recently begun to pursue a doctorate in social studies and global education.

Our PDS has been recognized by social studies professionals in other countries, and we have become teachers of teacher educators. Last year Steve Shapiro spent two months in Poland teaching Polish educators about school/university collaboration. We have had the stimulation of social studies educators from Japan, Germany, Korea, and Indonesia coming to visit our PDS Network to learn from our efforts. This year we have developed an electronic community for our PDS through a listserv which brings together our teachers, university colleagues, and many resource people around the world for conversations about social studies and global education. Our systemic exposure to current professional literature and our process of applying new ideas to our preparation of preservice teachers brings about a professional renewal that is profound.

We have also learned how to organize effective inservice workshops for

other social studies teachers in our buildings and build a learning community for ourselves as practicing teachers. In our 8-hour workshops for colleagues we create a larger sense of community across our eight schools and six districts and work on our shared mission in improving instruction in social studies and global education. The inservice workshops are developed by the field professors in consultation with our colleagues. Topics in last inservice workshop included the construction of rubrics for student assessment, a presentation on using Internet in the classroom, a discussion of teacher-written cases of actual problems with preservice teachers, and our sharing and critiquing of new instructional materials in social studies and global education. The inservice workshops play a major role in creating a shared vision for the PDS and in providing a time and place for us to discuss concerns and learn together.

These new roles and opportunities are both a joy and an additional responsibility. Although we have benefited from these new areas of learning, there is always a trade-off in what we do with our time. Sometimes opportunities such as conference presentations or available funding for new technologies become too much to deal with in an already overly crowded professional life. At times we have to make decisions between time for PDS and time for other parts of our professional and personal lives.

Factor 3: Challenging The Status Quo and Opening Ourselves to Scrutiny and Reflection

PDS collaboration changes the nature of our interaction with our colleagues in our schools. Before we began our PDS Network some of our colleagues in our social studies departments perceived that their assignment of a student teachers was a break when they could leave the classroom and be released from the day-to-day pressures of lesson planning and classroom management. Principals played a major role in deciding which teachers worked with student teachers. Some principals would allocate student teachers on the basis of "taking turns" so that all teachers could eventually have a break or the football coach could be helped by a student teacher fall quarter.

Our PDS program asks much more of our colleagues. Now we work closely with preservice teachers for two consecutive quarters. Every school day during PDS methods and student teaching three preservice teachers are working with each social studies department. We become of team of practicing teachers, preservice teachers, and people from the university. Rather than time out of our class, our PDS demands extensive time with preservice teachers and other colleagues in reflecting upon teaching and learning. We are the teachers of our preservice teachers, and our responsibilities are to interact intensely with them about every aspect of teaching. We also work together in portfolio assessments, in the development of teacher cases, and in helping each other across school and district boundaries.

Now preservice teachers are looking more closely at the practice of their cooperating teachers and probing deeply into the "whys" of teacher decision-making. This scrutiny has resulted in what a colleague said was "a good deal of soul searching and reflection on my part." A significant part of challenging the status quo in our schools and classrooms is opening everyone's practice to observation, discussion, and reflection. Some teachers are not comfortable with this openness and questioning as it goes against the isolation of many secondary teachers and may reveal some vulnerability that a teacher working alone can ignore. Those of us who work in interdisciplinary teams also have to convince people from other departments that it is worth the time and effort to be involved with additional people interacting in team meetings, raising questions or making suggestions.

Just as not all college students are cut out to be preservice teachers, not all educators are able to work effectively with preservice teachers in an atmosphere of reflective practice. We believe that classroom teachers should enter PDS relationships because they want to grow as a professionals, improve their own practice and contribute to the profession. The opportunities for growth have been considerable as we have become professors of a college methods class and worked closely with the best social studies teachers in our county. Through this scrutiny and reflection we have improved our work. We

have the confidence to present our ideas and practice at state and national conferences and publish our work in books and journals. We are proud to open our instructional decision-making and classroom practice to the intense scrutiny of preservice teachers, colleagues across buildings and districts, university people, and visitors to our PDS.

Factor 4: Making a Time Commitment

Time is always an issue. There is no way around the fact that collaboration takes time, both time in developing professional relationships and time in planning, teaching, reflecting, assessing, studying, writing, presenting and many day to day tasks. Nurturing interpersonal relationships within and among our schools is an on-going time commitment that will continue year after year. Although we have team-taught our methods course several times, we work each year to improve it through full-day planning sessions and after school meetings. We teach 20 seminars during methods. Each teacher in our PDS has developed areas of "expertise," and we work together in choosing readings and assignments for those topics and in preparing two-hour seminars and assessments for the preservice teachers. Because we work collaboratively, we continually spend time with other teachers making decisions about instruction and assessment.

Planning PDS programs and teaching the seminars are only part of the time commitment. Much more time is spent daily with our preservice teachers as we reflect with them about our practice and their practice (they begin to teach during the first week of methods) as we observe and debrief daily. We spend time showing them how we plan, grade, develop ideas, manage our classes and share every possible experience that can expose them to the reality of day to day teaching. From September through March we work with our preservice teachers daily.

The most significant time commitment may be over the long term. PDS work is not something that can be accomplished in a year or two and then dropped when the novelty wears off. It takes a long-term commitment to build relationships and develop procedures and assessments. We have changed social

studies teacher education at The Ohio State University because we have improved and refined our work over several years. PDS means long-term, intense relationships with other teachers and university professors. We must deal with the potential of burnout within our PDS and make decisions as to when or how some of us may want to move out of PDS work and bring new teachers or schools on board.

Factor 5: Dealing with University Cultures

In PDS work we not only work across schools but we also work with the university. For many of the field professors, one of the most challenging cultures we have had to adjust to has been the university environment. Although our own work with Merry in our PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education has been quite rewarding, we have had a number of negative experiences when OSU's College of Education has asked us to interact with other professors, other PDSs, and college administrators. We have left several meetings on campus feeling devalued as classroom teachers because we are often treated like guests who don't belong. After one meeting with all the OSU PDS professors and clinical educators (teachers who have release time to work collaboratively with the university), one field professor said he felt "almost relegated to student status." We do not want to be treated as guests, visitors or as observers, but as team members with equal status in PDS discussions. Yet Ohio State administrators have not even put us on the roster. Recognition of our roles could be as simple as our names appearing in a faculty directory, access to faculty parking stickers, or having a place on campus to conduct our PDS business.

One field professor received a letter from the president of the university. He was pleased as he opened it up because he assumed it was to recognize his role as a field professor in the our PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education. Alas, the letter was to thank him for his devoted service as an usher at OSU football games! This paradox (recognition for being an usher, no recognition for being a field professor who made a major contribution to building a superlative preservice teacher education

program) illustrates our frustration with the lack of recognition. We have made a very significant commitment in time and energy to the PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education program, and it has benefited us in many ways. Yet the failure of the university to recognize our efforts does diminish our enthusiasm.

A last illustration will show our frustration with the culture of university meetings. Two of us and Merry attended an OSU meeting that was to serve as formative evaluation for all OSU PDSs. We were placed in groups of PDSs to share experiences and ideas with others who are working in similar contexts. Our group consisted of all the secondary level PDSs--Secondary English Education, Project Tri (focusing on school restructuring) and the Reynoldsburg PDS (focusing on Coalition of Essential School reforms). This meeting seemed like an excellent opportunity to share and learn from others. However, in our group the English Education professor began by apologizing for her need to attend another meeting and announced she would need to go first and leave. She hurried though her program description and left. Immediately the coordinator of Project Tri also noted she had to go out of town, spoke quickly and left. This left the two of us and Merry to "share" our experience with the two people who remained. The message we heard from these busy folks was the same--what you have to say isn't important. Such interactions have damaged our PDS as we have often come away angry or hurt by the university peoples' ways of interacting with us.

## Conclusion

PDS collaboration can bring about a much higher level of professionalism and reflective practice as it brings many teachers out of virtual isolation in their classrooms into a stimulating learning community (Johnston & Kirshner, 1996). There is no question in our minds that our PDS Network has vastly improved the preparation of preservice teachers because we have begun to bridge the gap between theory and practice through our teaching and mentoring. It has changed the perspectives of our colleagues because their practice is placed under much greater scrutiny and because they have been asked to take

responsibility for the quality of the preservice experience.

Any new endeavor brings its own set of pros and cons, and PDS networks are no exception. Maintaining the high standards that we have set and working cooperatively across several school districts requires much time and effort. The opportunity to contribute to the profession and grow personally has certainly made it worthwhile for us. We have some very tangible rewards as some of our PDS graduates have been hired in our own schools, and we have seen our graduates compete very successfully across the country in the very competitive world of secondary social studies.

We see everyone winning with our PDS learning community. Practicing teachers grow professionally and enjoy many opportunities as a result of involvement in PDS. The preservice teachers leave much better prepared for the realities of teaching and have a better chance of being hired. Social studies students in middle and high schools ultimately benefit from their teachers' increased knowledge, skills, and revitalization.

Will our PDS survive? Our work together is not without problems. We still lack institutional rewards for teachers and professors and face the omnipresent problem of time and difficulties in changing conventional roles of both classroom teachers and university professors (see also Darling-Hammond, 1994; Stoddart, 1995). However, given all the constraints and concerns, those of us who have created a PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education cannot imagine ever again working in isolation away from a collaborative learning community.

## Reference

Alger, C. F., & Harf, J. E. (1986). Global education: Why? For whom? About what? In R. E. Freeman, (Ed.), Promising practices in global education: A handbook with case studies (pp. 1-13). NY: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies.

Alger, C. F. (1975). Columbus and the world. Columbus, OH: Mershon Center, The Ohio State University.

Berry, B., & Catoe, S. (1994). Creating professional development schools: Policy and practice in South Carolina's PDS initiative. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession (pp. 176-202). New York: Teachers College Press.

Book, C. L. (1996). Professional development schools. In J. Sikula (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 194-210). New York: Macmillan.

Brainard, F. (1989). Professional development schools: Status as of 1989 (Occasional Paper No. 9). Seattle: University of Washington, Institute for the Study of Educational Policy.

Brookhart, S. M., & Loadman, W. E. (1992). School university collaboration: Across cultures. Teaching Education, 4(2), 53-68.

Brookhart, S. M. & Loadman, W. E. (1990). School-university collaboration across cultures. Teaching Education 4(2), 53-68.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A national prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Author.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Developing professional development schools: Early lessons, challenge, and promises. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession (pp. 1-27). New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.). (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dove, T., Norris, J. & Shinew, D. (in press). Teachers' perspectives on school/university collaboration in global education. In M. M. Merryfield,

E. Jarchow, & S. Pickert (Eds.), Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Gehrke, N., Young, D., & Sagmiller, K. (1991, April). Critical analysis of the creation of a new culture: A professional development center for teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago.

Grossman, P. L. (1994). In pursuit of a dual agenda: Creating a middle level professional development school. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession (pp. 50-73). New York: Teachers College Press.

The Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Johnston, M. & Kirschner, B. (1996). The challenges of school/university collaboration [Special issue]. Theory Into Practice, 35(3).

Kagan, D. M. (1993). Laura and Jim and what they taught me about the gap between educational theory and practice. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Lanier, J. E. & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock, (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Leming, J.S. (1989). The two cultures of social studies education. Social Education 53, 404-408.

Leming, J. S. (1992). Ideological perspectives within the social studies profession: An empirical examination of the "two cultures" theses. Theory and Research in Social Education, 20(3), 293-312.

Levak, B. A., Merryfield, M. M., & Wilson, R. C. (1993). Global connections. Educational Leadership 51(1), 73-75.

Levine, M. (1992). A conceptual framework for professional practice schools. In M. Levine (Ed.), Professional practice schools: Linking teacher

education and school reform (pp. 8-24). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Meade, E. (1991). Reshaping the clinical phase of teacher preparation. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 666-669.

Merryfield, M. M., and White, C. (in press). Issues-centered global education. In R. Evans & D. W. Saxe, (Eds.) Handbook on teaching social issues. Washington D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Neufeld, J., & Freeman, D. (1993, February). Teachers as teacher educators within a professional development school context. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Diego.

Ruscoe, G. C., & Whitford, B. L. (1991, April). Quantitative and qualitative perspectives on teacher attitudes: The third year. Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago.

Ruscoe, G. C., Whitford, B. L., Egginton, W., & Esselman, M. (1989, March). Quantitative and qualitative perspectives on teacher attitudes in professional development schools. Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Rushcamp, S., & Roehler, L. R. (1992). Characteristics supporting change in a professional development school. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(1), 19-27.

Shapiro, S. & Merryfield, M. M. (1995). A case study of unit planning in the context of school reform. In M. M. Merryfield & Richard C. Remy, (Eds.), Teaching about international conflict and peace (pp. 41-123). Albany, NY: The State University of New York Press.

Shulman, J. H. & Colbert, J.A. (Eds). (1988). The intern teacher casebook. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Snyder, J. (1994). Perils and potentials: A tale of two professional

development schools. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession (pp. 98-125). New York: Teachers College Press.

Stoddart, T. (1993). The professional development school: Building bridges between cultures. In P. G. Altbach, H. G. Petrie, M. J. Shujaa, & L. Weiss (Eds.), Educational policy: Volume 7, Number 1. Professional development schools (pp. 5-23). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Stoddart, T. (1995). The professional development school: Building bridges between cultures. In H. G. Petrie (Ed.), Professionalization, partnership, and power: Building professional development schools (pp.41-76). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Wilson, S. M., with Miller, C., & Yerkes, C. (1993). Deeply rooted change: A tale of learning to teach adventurously. In D. K. Cohen, M. W. McLaughlin, & J. E. Talbert (Eds.), Teaching for understanding: Challenges for policy and practice (pp. 84-129). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wiseman, D. L., & Nason, P. L. (1993, February). School university partnerships: Patterns of interactions between participants. Working draft of a paper presented at the annual conference of American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Diego.

Woloszyk, C. A. (1992, February). A study of school climate in a secondary professional development school. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Antonio, TX.

Zeichner, K. M. (1992). Rethinking the practicum in the professional development school partnership. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 296-307.

Zeichner, K. M. & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32(3), 7-11.

Zeichner, K. M., Tabachnick, B. R., & Densmore, K. (1987). Individual, institutional, and cultural influences on the development of teachers' craft knowledge. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), Exploring teachers' thinking (pp. 21-59).

London: Cassell.

Zimpher, N. L. (1990). Creating professional development school sites. Theory Into Practice, 29(1), 42-49.